

**REMARKS**

**I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS**

Claim 21 is added. Claims 18 and 20 are canceled herein without prejudice or disclaimer. Various claims are amended herein. Therefore, claims 1, 2, 5-8, 10-17, 19 and 21 are pending and under consideration.

No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

**II. CLAIM 20 IS REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH AS BEING INDEFINITE.**

Claim 20 is canceled herein. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted, the rejection is moot.

**III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 5, 7, 8, 10-12 AND 19 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY SUZUKI ET AL. (U.S. PATENT NO. 5,736,982)**

Independent claim 19 is amended to include features of "objected to" claim 20. Somewhat similar amendments are made to claims 1, 5, 10, 11, 12 and 19.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

**IV. CLAIMS 2 AND 6 ARE REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER SUZUKI IN VIEW OF TOOMEY ET AL. (US PATENT NO. 6,119, 147)**

Claims 2 and 6 depend from claims 1 and 5 respectively. Therefore, claims 2 and 6 are allowable for at least the reasons stated in section III above.

Furthermore, the Examiner concedes Suzuki fails to specifically disclose sending an event detection time with the instructions and addresses. Therefore, the Examiner relies on Toomey et al. (Toomey) to teach an event detection time along with instructions to a recipient in order to record the time the event occurred so a history of a meeting can be developed. Thus, by the Examiner's own analysis, the system taught by Toomey records "the time the event occurred." (see page 7, item 16 of the Office Action).

In contrast, for example, while Toomey teaches recording a history of events, the present invention, as recited for example in claim 5, from which claim 6 depends, "transmitting the determined plurality of the different control instructions and/or the determined plurality of the different operation instructions corresponding to the event via the chat system to the determined corresponding chat device destinations to operate the image representations and/or the physical representations of the chat participants." Further, for example, claim 6 recites *the transmitter transmits an originating address of each determined operation instruction, a destination address of each determined operation instruction, and an event detection time, to each corresponding different chat device destination together with the determined operation instruction*. Therefore, the present invention as recited in claim 6 transmits an event detection time with the determined operation instruction. This is different from **recording** the time of an event as recited by Toomey.

Although the above comments are specifically directed to claim 6, it is respectfully submitted that the comments would be helpful in understanding various differences of various other claims (e.g. 2) over the cited references.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

**V. CLAIM 13 IS REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER SUZUKI IN VIEW OF THE APPLICANTS ADMITTED PRIOR ART**

Claim 13 depends from claim 5. Therefore, claim 13 is allowable for at least the reasons stated in section III above.

Furthermore, the applicants response filed October 17, 2005 and February 16, 2006 addresses the Examiner's Official Notice assertion while responding to the rejection of claim 2. The applicant specifically request the Examiner provide support for the rejection. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted, no admissions have been made regarding claim 13.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

**VI. CLAIMS 14-17 ARE REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER SUZUKI IN VIEW OF SHIIO ET AL (U.S. PATENT NO. 5,491,743)**

Claims 14 – 17 depend directly or indirectly from claim 5. Therefore, claims 14 – 17 are allowable for at least the reasons stated in section III above.

Furthermore, the Examiner concedes Suzuki fails to disclose detecting overlapping events. Therefore, the Examiner relies on Shiio et al. (Shiio) to teach a virtual conferencing system for displaying animated characters within a virtual space. (citing column 9, line 61 thru column 10, line 13 of Shiio). However, the cited passage in Shiio teaches a plurality of operators simultaneously requesting operation right to a shared chalkboard, where in the operation rights can be granted on a first-come-first-served basis for example. (see for example, column 9, lines 61 - column 10, line 7 of Shiio). Therefore, Shiio does fail to disclose "the chat event detector detects a plurality of the events at same chat device destination or at same **image representation and/or physical representation of a chat participant,**" as recited in for example, claim 14. Shiio only discloses a method of operational control of a virtual chalk board.

Although the above comments are specifically directed to claim 14, it is respectfully submitted that the comments would be helpful in understanding various differences of various other claims (e.g. 15 – 17) over the cited references.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

#### VIII. CONCLUSION


There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: December 06, 2006

By:   
Joseph W. Iskra  
Registration No. 57,485

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501